

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,062	07/29/2003	Jyoti Mazumder	POM-13202/29	5850
25006	25006 7590 05/09/2006		EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C			PADGETT, MARIANNE L	
PO BOX 702 TROY, MI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1762	

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• •						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/629,062	MAZUMDER, JYOTI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Marianne L. Padgett	1762			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
Period fo	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	VIS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH	(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS.			
WHIC - Externafter - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIEN OF THE MAILING T	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju	<u>ıly 2003</u> .				
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🛛	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
,	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
-	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	alastian requirement				
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
. —	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Offic	e Action of John F10-132.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		ved in this National Stage			
	application from the International Burea					
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not receiv	/ea.			
Attach	nt/c)					
Attachme	nt(s) ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa	ry (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)						
	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	. Gener periodical (1 1 0 104)			

Application/Control Number: 10/629,062

Art Unit: 1762

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, drawn to a "CAD" (undefined in the specification, probably involves computer) controlled process of depositing metal on a mold or a die or a tool, classified in class 427, subclass 135 (for a mold), or 445 (miscellaneous, for everything else), but would be 427/9 if any measuring and testing was positively claimed or 427/554 if the process employed lasers as in the figures.
- II. Claims 15-20, drawn to any metal coated or impregnated tool, die or mold, classified in class 428, subclass 544+ (possibly 596, or if any particular materials as used in the process were claimed 538, 650, 651 or 658).
- 2. The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by virtually any metal coating technique, as the surface modified by a metal deposit has no particular characteristics required by the process claims, especially considering that "closed-loop, direct metal deposition process" as variously mentioned in the specification, does not appear to be provided therein with any necessarily required steps to distinguish its results from any other metal coating or metal deposition process.

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of substrates (body): i) aluminum based;

ii) steel (Fe based);

and species of coatings: i) Mo alloy;

ii) Zn alloy.

Application/Control Number: 10/629,062

Art Unit: 1762

The species are independent or distinct because both sets of species represent elements in different periodic table groupings, thus may be expected to have different chemistries, thus different patentability considerations.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Currently, claims 1-7 & 14-20 generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. A telephone call was made to John Posa on 5/5/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Mr. Posa requested that the restriction be mailed, as he will not do restrictions by telephone practice.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marianne L. Padgett whose telephone number is (571) 272-1425. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from about 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks, can be reached at (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

Art Unit: 1762

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MLP/dictation software

5/5/2006

MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER